

REMARKS

This Amendment accompanies a Request for Continued Examination and is also in response to the Final Office Action dated February 2, 2007. By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended and claims 3 and 9 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10-12 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,429,756 to Kurisu et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a dielectric resonator that includes a protrusion portion disposed on a bottom surface of a dielectric resonance element, wherein “an area of the bottom surface of the dielectric resonance element is larger than the area on the upper surface of the protrusion portion.” With the structure of the dielectric resonator defined in independent claim 1, the magnetic field distribution can be spread to the area under tapered portion and the durability and wear resistance of the molding die can be increased. See page 20, line 24 to page 21, line 5 of the present application.

The dielectric resonator described in Kurisu et al. does not have the area of the bottom surface of the dielectric resonance element larger than the area on the upper surface of the protrusion portion. In contrast, the dielectric resonator of Kurisu et al. has the area of the bottom surface of the dielectric element the same size as the area of the upper surface of the protrusion portion. Therefore, Kurisu et al. does not teach or suggest all the limitations as defined in independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as defined in independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art of record.

Claims 2, 4-8 and 10-12 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and include all of the limitations found therein. Each of these dependent claims includes additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the claims from which they depend, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record. Accordingly, claims 2, 4-8 and 10-12 are likewise patentable.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of the amendments to claim 1, and allowance of the present application with claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10-12 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: June 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Richard LaCava/
Richard LaCava
Registration No.: 41,135
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant